

to provide for the free coinage of gold and silver bullion, and for other purposes," and if said bill shall not be disposed of on said day, then the consideration thereof shall be continued during the next legislative day.

The yeas on the adoption of this resolution were 196; the nays were 154.

The affirmative vote was made up of 117 Democrats, ten Populists and nine Republicans. The negative vote was formed of ninety five Democrats and fifty-nine Republicans. Counting the recognized pairs, an analysis of the party strength as shown in this vote, displays the fact that 13 per cent. of the Republican representatives were for free coinage; 54 per cent. of the Democratic and 100 per cent. of the People's party. This half score of men are Baker, Clover, Davis, Otis and Simpson, of Kansas; Halvorsen, of Minnesota; Kem and McKeighan, of Nebraska, and Watson and Winn of Georgia.

WHITEHAWK REID'S, TRIBUNE EDITORIAL.

The following is taken from the New York Tribune of July 14, 1892:

The defeat of the free coinage bill in the house, thanks to the Republican members, is complete. It is a curious fact that some of the Democrats, who would not have dared to vote against free silver coinage directly, were able to muster pluck to vote against the motion to take up the bill, so that those Republicans probably turned the scale who decided to kill the bill at the first chance if they could, and not to wait for the final vote. It was the best opportunity to put an end for this year to all anxiety in business quarters about this dangerous measure, and the Republican minority served the country rather than party, as it usually does, and rightly.

Everyone knows that the Democratic vote against taking up the bill was not cast exclusively, nor even mainly, by Democrats who are opposed to silver coinage. Much the largest part of it came from Democratic representatives who mean to vote for free coinage whenever they think they can afford to do so, but who do not dare now, with a presidential election close at hand, to face the consequences of such a vote. After the November election more than half of the Democrats who followed ex-Speaker Reed yesterday, can be expected to vote for any free coinage bill, no matter how extreme or absurd, and a change of less than twenty of them would have passed the Stewart bill yesterday.

An obvious purpose of the Democratic minority was to get the silver question out of the presidential canvass. But they are wasting time. If there were nothing else to make the question prominent, the Alliance agitators certainly would, compelling Democratic candidates in western and southern states publicly to pledge themselves for free silver in order to avoid loss of votes. But these things cannot be done in a corner, and the east will know what the west and south are doing. Pledges and speeches made in the regions where silver fanaticism prevails will be quoted and will have their rightful influence upon public opinion, and upon the confidence of men in the Democratic party in the eastern states.

No vote in the house this year could be expected to show the full strength of free coinage among the Democrats. Scores of Democratic representatives who would vote for the measure at any other time have felt compelled to vote against such a bill this year, on the ground that its passage would hurt the party in the presidential election. In the language of Senator Vest, they want the Democratic party to get full power first and it will then settle the silver question in its own way. These men want delay, but they would vote for free coinage next winter or at any future time. If these, with the small minority of Democrats who really oppose free coinage, prevent the passage of a bill this summer with the aid of Republicans, they hope to get strong enough to pass a free coinage bill hereafter, and they do not believe that a Democratic president will ever set himself against the declared wishes of his party.

Hence the question cannot be taken out of the canvass, no matter what leaders at

Washington may desire. The whole business world sees that the overwhelming majority of Democrats stand ready to enact free coinage as soon as they can without sacrificing the presidential election. If the party can get power, it will not hesitate to do what Democratic masses of the west and south passionately demand. It will bring to bear upon any president elected by Democratic votes a kind of coercion which no such president has ever resisted, namely, the dictates of a party caucus, with an appeal to save the party from overthrow in the states where the silver craze prevails.

In the light of this and previous votes, one thing seems to be plain. The men who desire a sound currency in this country cannot afford to put the Democratic party into power. What its prejudices and tendencies are they must now know. What restraining force there may be, at any time, with that party in control of the government, no man can safely calculate. There is but one safe thing to do, and that is to intrust the government to the only party which has upheld and still upholds honest money, by the election of the Republican national candidates and a Republican congress.

On March 24, 1892, Hon. Edward H. Funston voted with the silver men; but the Tribune of to-day speaks of him as follows:

Mr. Funston, Republican, of Kansas, who voted against laying the Bland bill on the table, to-day voted against consideration.

The Republicans who voted with the "People's" representatives, are Bartine of Nevada, Bowers of California, Cheatham of North Carolina, Clark of Wyoming, Johnson of Indiana, Jolley of South Dakota, Post of Illinois, Sweet of Idaho, and Townsend of Colorado. Broderick of Kansas was paired with Hopkins of Illinois, Hermann of Oregon with Boutelle of Maine, and Pickler of South Dakota with Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. Thomas, speaker of the "Reed House," two years, in the height of his glory, made his longest speech of this session, from which the following is extracted from the Tribune:

Mr. Speaker, whenever you come to actual business, the Republican party takes the front position, as it does to-day. [Applause on Republican side.] It does not shrink the responsibility, but leads the hosts of opposition at all times, and under all circumstances, to plans and methods of legislation which would injure the currency of the country, and throw a cloud over its business prosperity.

But there is another class with whom I have no sympathy; and that is the class of men who desire to debase the currency of this country for the purpose of paying their debts in a cheaper coinage than that in which they contracted them. I refer to the men who, in order to relieve themselves of individual embarrassment, are willing to wreck their country. And there is still another class against which I have all possible objection, and that is the class which is sometimes represented here, of men who, without believing for an instant in the doctrine they advocate, are joining in the popular clamor in order to get for themselves offices, or to enable their party to assume that "public trust" which they are so anxious always to secure.

The Republican party is not established for the purpose of obtaining office. [Cries of "Oh, no," and derisive laughter on the Democratic side.] It is established for the purpose of carrying out principles. You sneer, but look out of your eyes at the very scenes before you. To-day we are enabling a Democratic house to profit by our action, and thereby, seemingly, to do a better service to the country than a Republican senate, and we are doing it ourselves unselfishly. [Applause on the Republican side.] There, Mr. Speaker, is where we rise above party in all great public questions in a manner wherein the history of the Democratic party in the United States affords neither example nor precept. What we must do is that which is best for the country, and that we stand ready to do under all circumstances. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

"FARMER" FUNSTON IN JUNE, 1890.

A little more than two years ago, this man Funston made a speech in the house of representatives on the silver question, and here are extracts from the same:

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion no question of greater importance than this one has been before this house since the great questions growing out of the war were settled. Along by the side of the principles of human rights and the maintenance of the government, lies its financial system. Our fathers believed this and ingrafted into the constitution a clause conferring upon the general government the right to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the alarming condition of the business of the country, arising, not by reason of the tariff nor over production, as has been claimed on this floor, but by reason of an insufficiency of currency, demands that the mints be thrown open and every ounce of available silver be coined into standard dollars. The people are expecting this; they are demanding this; and, mark my word, the man from the west who stands out against it will forever have hung his political "harp on the willow tree."

The people of the west, and south and northwest have taken up this question in earnest, and they mean that every man in this body from those sections, who opposes free coinage, shall be made to feel their power at the polls. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill and shall accept it only when I have found it impossible to get anything better. The principles of it are wrong. It reduces silver from the rank it holds as a coin and stores it away as a commodity on which money is to be issued at its value in gold.

Could anything be more humiliating to the friends of the silver dollar, than to see it divested of all its functions as money, and then stored away in the basement of the treasury, dishonored and disgraced?

By what authority does any one make the charges of the silver dollar being a 72-cent dollar? One dollar in silver may not contain 100 cents in gold, but it does contain 100 cents in silver. One dollar in silver will purchase as much of the necessities of life as a dollar in gold, and as much as it would at any other time during the last hundred years. One dollar in silver to-day contains as much pure silver as it did in 1794, when it was made the coin of the country. It has never varied in its weight of silver, while gold, in 1834, was changed in weight to make it conform to the value of the silver dollar, and thus, if precedent be law, showing that silver should be the measure of value.

Much of the time, during the life of the government, the silver dollar has possessed a greater intrinsic value than the gold dollar, and it was only when legislated against and deprived of its functions as money that it and gold parted in value to any great degree. And why should not silver go down under such circumstances? If, by an act of Congress, its use as tableware could be prohibited, its value would go still lower, and if its use for all purposes could be destroyed it would have no value whatever.

Things are valuable only for the purposes they serve. Restore silver to its normal condition as a currency by the side of gold and gold will have less value because of its reduced purposes, and silver will become more valuable because of its additional purposes, and thus the two coins approach each other so nearly in value that there would be no observable difference.

And now, Mr. Speaker, if the charge be true that the silver dollar is worth only 72 cents, I am puzzled to know how the gentlemen who make that charge are to explain to their constituents the justice of forcing the borrower to pay 100 cents for every 72 cents borrowed.

Either these gentlemen do not believe what they say about the lack of value in the silver dollar, or else they are deliberately, and with the full knowledge of the facts before them, deciding that every man who has borrowed a hundred dollars shall pay for the same \$138. Gentlemen who are so concerned about the 72-cent dollar can take either horn of this dilemma, and it will leave them in a very uncomfortable position before their constituents. As for myself,

while I admit there is a difference in the intrinsic value of the two coins, I deny there is any difference in their purchasing power.

Therefore, should I be compelled to vote for this bill as the only thing I can get, I will have no such ugly inconsistencies to account for. And now, Mr. Speaker, granting, for the sake of argument, that the gold dollar is more valuable than the silver dollar, can anyone point out the justice or law for demanding of the debtor that he shall pay his debts in the most valuable coin? Should he not have the same right to say which dollar he may pay in as the man from whom he has borrowed?

And are we constantly to go on fitting up the less valuable coin to correspond with the more valuable one, or should we not here and now declare that the dollar of our fathers is good enough for us? And if there is to be any change in either to correspond with the other, let us follow precedent and make the change in the gold.

But we are gravely told that we must have the world's money; that England and Germany have a gold standard.

Why should we follow England and Germany in preference to co-operating with the balance of the world in the use of silver? With England especially we have no special interests. She is free trade; we are protection. The world owes her five thousand million dollars, and we owe the world vast sums. Her interests lead her to demand payment in the dearest money; our interests lead us to pay in the cheapest. She buys but little of the products of our farms and nothing of our factories. She is our competitor and rival in every part of the world, and, in fact, if she were sunk into the sea, America would be but little worse off. Our interests lie with the bimetallic countries of Central and South America and Mexico. Their trade will be worth millions to us when developed, and our medium of exchange with them, if that is of any importance, should be the same as theirs. When we have captured their trade we need bother ourselves but very little about whether or not our currency is the same as England's.

And after all, Mr. Speaker, it is but little difference to us what may be the currency of the balance of the world. Their money ceases to be money when it reaches our shores, and the same is the case with ours when taken abroad. All foreign money the world over is bullion, and is so treated, and it makes no difference what stamp or weight it has, it is traded in as bullion.

Therefore, the weight or value of our coin can have nothing to do with our trade with foreign countries. It is of far greater importance to us that we adopt the most convenient medium of exchange among ourselves, and in quantity sufficient to transact the business of the country.

Our first duty is to look after our own people in their relation to each other. When we have done that it will be time enough to take our bearings to the balance of the world. Let us build up and foster our own industries, cherish and love our own institutions, coin our own dollars of fine American silver, and we will have but little occasion to bother ourselves about what the balance of the world is doing.

Freemen of Kansas! In the foregoing brief epitome of the senate and house record of this first half of July, 1892, on the silver question, providing for the coinage of silver as of gold prior to silver demonetization in the year of our Lord, 1873—will you deliberately look at this one little issue in the campaign of 1892 with the impartial judgment that free coinage truly merits? Can you want a "600 grain" silver dollar Perkins in the United States senate, after the legislature of 1893, in January next, shall elect his successor? Can it possibly give you satisfaction to divide your patriotic, self-respecting votes in the Second congressional district of Kansas, between Horace L. Moore and Samuel S. King, so that thereby that political exotic on the fair soil of that most splendid district may continue to be misrepresented in the Fifty-third congress of the United States of America by its present incubus upon that portion of the great body politic? It is believed you can solve the true problem.

J. C. H.

Washington, July 14, 1892.